

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 2, 5, and 9 for containing informalities. The objection to the claimed "first" solution in claims 1 and 5 is improper/because a "second" solution is recited in dependent claims 2 and 6. Applicant has amended the claims to correct the other cited informalities.

Applicant traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-8 over Honma (U.S. Patent 6,992,060).

The priority date of the present application is October 10, 2002. The International filing date of Honma is August 28, 2002, and the listed § 371(c)(1),(2),(4) date is February 4, 2004. Honma does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)(1) because WO 03/021005, (a copy of which is attached), was published in Japanese, not in English. WO 03/021005 was published on March 13, 2003, which is subsequent to the priority date of the present application. Also attached, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.55(a)(3), is an English translation of the certified priority document, JP 2002-298607, and a statement that the translation is accurate. In view of the Applicant having perfected its claim for priority, Honma is not prior art.

Applicant nevertheless traverses any argument that Honma anticipates the present claims. As recited, e.g., in claims 1 and 5, a resin material, which is irradiated with UV rays, is in contact with a first solution containing ozone in a concentration of about 10 ppm or more. Support for this claim language can be found at paragraph [0021] of the specification, and hence no new matter has been added.

In contrast, Honma discloses, e.g., at page 10, last line to page 11, line 6, soaking resin in water or a solution to irradiate it with UV rays while bubbling a gas, and subsequently electroless plating it. Example 11 of Honma discloses using air as the

bubbles, not a solution containing ozone. Honma employs air bubbles in order to reflect UV rays, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not substitute a solution containing ozone for air with this goal in mind. Moreover, even if Honma includes a suggestion to substitute a solution containing ozone for the air, Honma still includes no disclosure or suggestion of contacting the irradiated resin with a solution containing ozone in a concentration of about 10 ppm or more. Honma, therefore, even if it qualified as prior art, neither anticipates nor suggests the present claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 11, 2008

By: 
James W. Edmondson
Reg. No. 33,871

Attachments: WO 03/021005; English translation of JP 2002-298607; statement that the translation is accurate.